



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

House of Fame, i. 35) or it may be a case of anacoluthon due to the interposition of the singular noun *Launcelot*, or to the taking of the whole preceding phrase as a clause.

dare, 192.34, is subjunctive, as always in conditional sentences. *Darest* would be ungrammatical.

THE STRONG VERBS.

CLASS I, §135.

2 *strade*, in *bestrade*, 860.6.

2 *droofe*, 700.18, occurs also at 179.12. The commoner form *drofe* occurs at 156.3, 193.17, 691.11, 695.3, 710.3, etc.

3 *wreton*, 614.2, has an ending not found elsewhere. A typographical error is to be suspected.

CLASS II, §137.

2 *chosen*, 663.20. The plural *-en* is discussed, in its place, at §187.

2 *clafe*, 693.21, is the common form: 197.22, 198.23, 199.5.9, 220.25, etc. [*Clefte*] occurs at 174.1.

2 *flay*, 689.13. I confess that I doubted this preterit because of the curious sense it seemed to make: and [he] *putte a spere forth, and smote the fyrste that he flay to the erthe*. Taking the *that*-clause as adjective instead of consecutive, it was easy to suppose *slay* by a printer's error of *f* for long *s*. The meaning then would be 'the first that he hit.' But a preterit *slay* was as difficult as a preterit *flay*, Malory's forms being *slawe* (*slough*) and *flewe*. Halliwell (*Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*), indeed, prints a Chaucerian preterit *flaie*, but gives no citations. That Malory's *flay* is, however, from (*flye*) seems to be proved by the following from Halliwell, under *fley* (a common Chaucerian preterit):

"Grete strokys the yeant gafe,
And to the erthe flay his stafte."

MS. Cantab. ff. ii, 38, f. 64.

Will some one give me information concerning this poem, and at the same time, perhaps, cite a Chaucerian preterit *flay*?

CLASS III, §141.

1 *flynge*, 589.31; 2 *flang*, pl., 192.1.

2 *swange*, 294.21, cited in foot-note to p. 40.

3 *wonne*, 193.5, 231.6, 235.1, 134.13.

CLASS IV, §147.

2 *bere*, 713.24.

broke, 258.28, is not preterit, but participle.

2 *come*, 270.28, 699.1.

2 *ware*, 468.27, occurs also 851.31.

CLASS V, §149.

2 *yaf*. Doctor Norton seems to be right in his assumption that this occurs only in *foryaf*, 43.32.

2 *saw*. 204.35.

CLASS VI, §150.

2 *forsoke*, 212.13; 3 *forsaken*, 854.38.

2 *shoke*, 694.35, 849.19.

2 *wasshe*, pl., 550.19, cited in foot-note.

2 *wake*, in (*a*)*wake*, 848.9.

Citations for the presents *shyne* (i.), *rynge*, *stynge* (iii.), *forsake*, *shake*, *wasshe* (vi.), I have not with me at present. But these are the less important as being, with the single exception of *wasshe*, sufficiently vouched for by other verbs of their respective classes.

It remains for me to thank both Professor Hempl and Doctor Norton.

CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN.

Columbia College.

ON THE ORIGIN OF *i* AND *ū* IN AORIST-PRESENTS IN GER- MANIC.

IN an article in PBB. xviii, 522 ff., Hirt seeks to explain the *i* and *ū* in aorist-presents as due to the disappearance of a nasal. He gives the following instances:

1. O.E. *belife*, O.H.G. *belibu*: Skt. *lim-pāmi*, Lith. *līmpū*.
2. Goth. *fra-weitip*: Skt. *vindāti*.
3. O.E. *sniweð*: Lat. *ninguit*, Lith. *sninga*.
4. O.E. *smūgan*; Lith. *smunkū*.
5. O.E. *pūte*: Skt. *tundāte*, Lat. *tundit*.
6. W.G. *wigan*: Lat. *vincō*.
7. O. E., O.H.G. *sigan*: Skt. *siñcāti*.

Now as these aorist-presents all belong to the *ei*- and *eu*-series, and correspond to forms in allied languages with a short vowel or a nasal-infix, he assumes that in these series, *in* and *un* > *i* and *ū* > *i* and *ū*.

No reason can be given why, in an unaccented syllable, Germ. *inx* < *enx*, or *unx* <

ux, or any other vowel+nasal, should not have developed in the same way.

However we will examine the theory as given by Hirt.

To the list given by Hirt we must add the following since they come under his law.

1. Goth. *hneiwan* < $\sqrt{knehig-}$ or $\sqrt{knejq-}$. Here we have the long vowel together with the indication, according to Sievers' law, of suffix-accentuation. According to Hirt, therefore, this *i* must be due to compensative lengthening. Cf. O.E. *snūweð*.

2 O.N. *klīfa*, O.H.G. *chlīban*: O.H.G. *chlimban*. $\sqrt{glekþ}$. Here also we have an aorist-present.

Further we may add the following, though neither Verner's nor Sievers' law gives us any light.

3. Got. *deigan*: Lat. *fiŋgō*- $\sqrt{dheighh-}$.

4. O.E. *mīgan*, O. N. *mīga*: Lat. *mingo*. $\sqrt{meigh}$.

5. O.H.G. *blihan*, O.E. *blican*: N.H.G., Mid. E. *blinken*.

6. O.H.G. *strihan*: Lat. *stringō*, Lith. *stringu*.

7. Goth. *beitan*: Lat. *findō*.

8. O.E. *slīdan*, M. H. G. *sliten*: O.H.G. *slintan*, Goth. *fra-slindan*.

9. O.H.G. *glizzan*, O.S. *glītan*: M. H. G. *glinzen*.

10. O.H.G. *slīfan*, O.E. *to-slīpan*: O. N. *sleppa* < **slimp-*.

These are not the only verbs that would come under Hirt's law. In the same way we should be forced to explain the *ū* in O.E. *slūpan*, *sūpan*, *dūfan*, *scūfan*, *lūtan*, *hrūtan*, *strūdan*, *brūcan*, *lūcan*, *sūcan* and *sūgan*, *būgan*, not to mention similar verbs in the other dialects.

In this class would belong also the verbs that have restored the diphthong by analogy of other verbs in the same ablaut-series. Such verbs would be O. N. *smiūga*, O. H. G. **smiogan*, since these must also have been aorist-presents, as is shown by the *g* as compared with the *k* of Lith. *smukti*. Other examples of the same kind, to mention no more, are: M.H.G. *biogan*, Goth. *biugan*, cf. O.H.G. *buhil*; and O.H.G. *scioban*, Goth. *skiuban*, cf. O.H.G. *sciūvala*.

We shall have difficulty in referring all these to the nasal-infix class.

But to make the matter certain there are actually verbs derived from roots with *ek* that have retained the nasal-infix. Some of these have already been given in the examples above, viz., N. H. G., Mid. E. *blinken*; O. H. G. *slintan*, Goth. *fra-slindan*; M. H. G. *glinzen*; O. N. *sleppa*. Furthermore we have: Got. *siggan*, $\sqrt{seig-}$. Cf. O.H.G. *seihhen*, and the by-form of the root *seig-* in O.H.G. *sihan* and *sigan*. (Cf. No. 7 in Hirt's list).

Goth. *stiggan*, $\sqrt{steig-}$, cf. Lat. *in-stig-are*.

Goth. *windan*, $\sqrt{ueik+t}$, cf. Skt. *vi-tās*.

O.H.G. *swintan*, $\sqrt{s ek+t}$, cf. O.H.G. *swīnan*.

Finally we may add that if Germanic had been so averse to retaining the nasal where it originally belonged, it would not have generalized the nasal-infix. And yet we find that, with the one exception of *standan*, the nasal-infix, where occurring, is found in all forms of the verb.

If we admit that in these aorist-presents the vowel of the stem was originally short, how shall we explain its present length? The fact that the *i* and *ū* occur only in the *ek-* and *eu-* series ought to help us to a solution. We nowhere find a form corresponding to a Gothic **geitan*, but always to a *gitan*; though in all the other languages in which the same verb occurs there is a nasal-infix: Grk. *χαρδάνω*, Lat. *pre-hendō*, Alb. *gendem*, Let. *gidu* (< *gendu*), Lith. *gendū*. So we shall not need to start with forms with a nasal-infix.

Now in some of the verbs at least there was probably a short vowel, as Hirt assumes for all of them.

From a Germanic *uigō* we have O.H.G. *ubarwēhan*, O.E. *wēgan*, O.N. *vēga*, O.Norw. *viga*. These have gone over to the fifth ablaut-series. By the side of these occur W. G. *wigan* and Gothic *weihan*. If now with Osthoff, PBB. viii, 291 we say that the *h* in *weihan* arose from the perfect, and that originally there was only *uigō*, and certainly the *h* in O.H.G. *ubar-wēhan* cannot be original; then we may infer that in *wigan* the *i* has been introduced from the regular type just as the diphthong was brought into Goth. *biugan*, *skiuban*, etc. The same thing may have taken place in other verbs, of which double forms have not been preserved.

In other cases the long vowel was without doubt original. This would be the case at least where the roots contained the long diphthongs *ē* and *ey*; for here certainly the *tiefstufe* might be *ī* and *ū*. Cf. Joh. Schmidt, KZ., 26, 13ff., Wilhelm Schulze, KZ., 27, 420ff, Per Persson, *Stud. z. L. v. d. Wurzelernw*, p. 117.

Such may be the origin of *ū* in O.E. *pūte* and others. This would furnish a type after which other verbs might be modeled. A further move in this direction would bring in the diphthong, and this we have in O. E. *pōtan*, O.H.G. *diozan*, etc. After all, however, it is simpler to start with *ī* and *ū* as the "nebentonige tiefstufe" of *e* and *ey*.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

FRENCH DRAMA.

Die Vergleiche in Montchrestiens Tragödien.

Ein Beitrag zur inneren Geschichte des französischen Dramas im xvi Jahrhundert von Dr. SIGMUND SCHOLL. Nördlingen: 1894. 8vo, 68 pp., 1.20 M.

IN limiting his study of Montchrestien to the figures of speech, the comparisons or the similes of the dramatist—all of which seem included under the title of *Vergleiche*—the author has chosen the most pleasing side of the subject, and has attained results none the less interesting and suggestive. Possibly the dependance of one writer on another, the influence exerted by a master on his pupil, is most clearly shown by the language, and more particularly by the figurative language, in which the thoughts of the two are expressed. For ideas are universal, the product of the environment, and plots may be made common property by the literary generation which may have given rise to them. The phrases of conversation and exhortation are also more or less the same, obligatory and conventional. But the use of similes is something more personal and individual, peculiar to the rearing and education, and the intellectual sympathies of the man.

The object, then, in making a catalogue of Montchrestien's comparisons and figures of speech, is to fix his place in the order of liter-

ary descent, and thereby ascertain who were his literary ancestors. Scholl, however, does not content himself with the accomplishment of this task alone; but having once undertaken his investigation, he supplements it with a bibliography of his subject which must be fairly exhaustive, comprising as it does the titles of upwards of one hundred articles. His main theme is furthermore prefaced by a critical review of the more important notices of Montchrestien, from the allusions in Malherbe down to the biographies of the present school of critics.

After this introduction comes the classification of the material offered by Montchrestien's dramas. As might be inferred, nature and physical phenomena claim here a large part of the similes and comparisons, while the vegetable, mineral and animal kingdoms come in for their share. Man also in his various attributes is responsible for not a few, while pastoral and sea-faring life, mythology and history and even manufactured articles, furnish their quota. In all, some two hundred comparisons testify to the richness of Montchrestien's imaginative language.

Having enumerated the number and kind of similes, it is now incumbent on our author to discover by means of them the relation which they may have to like expressions in the works of previous dramatists and writers. Garnier, whose disciple Montchrestien is assumed to be, is naturally the first to enter into comparison. Many correspondences in figurative expressions show the close connection between him and his follower. Next in importance is Homer, whether directly, or indirectly through Virgil and Garnier. At this point an interesting fact is established by Scholl, which proves that Montchrestien did not read Homer in the original. A comparison of the French writer's *Hector* with Hugues Salel's translation of the *Iliad* (Scholl's reference is to an edition of Salel published in 1574) shows that this version was the dramatist's source of information. Even the phrases are almost identical in the two volumes.

Other assumed progenitors of Montchrestien do not offer so many facilities for comparison in the matter of similes. Trissino's